## Exhibit J

```
1
             UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
             EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
2
3
   IN RE: OIL SPILL
                           ) MDL NO. 2179
   BY THE OIL RIG
4
   "DEEPWATER HORIZON" IN ) SECTION "J"
   THE GULF OF MEXICO, ON )
5
   APRIL 20, 2010
                           ) JUDGE BARBIER
                           ) MAG. JUDGE SHUSHAN
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
                   *****
                        VOLUME 1
                   *****
18
19
20
                Deposition of ANDREW GEORGE
21
   INGLIS, taken at Kirkland & Ellis
22
   International, 30 St. Mary Axe, 22nd Floor,
23
   London EC3A 8AF, England, United Kingdom, on
24
   the 21st day of July, 2011.
25
```

```
1
         by late changes to well design and
      2
         procedures.
      3
                       Do you agree with that?
      4
               Α.
                      Again, on the basis of what I
12:14
      5
         read in the -- in the -- in the Bly Report,
         one of the recommendations was around the
      6
      7
         management of change process.
      8
               0.
                      All right. And so based on what
      9
         you read in the Bly Report, you agree with
12:14 10
         that, correct?
     11
                      Within that context.
               Α.
     12
                      All right. And then going on,
               0.
     13
         quote, BP did not have adequate controls in
     14
         place to ensure that key decisions in the
12:14 15
         months leading up to the blowout were safe or
     16
         sound from an engineering perspective.
     17
                      Do you -- do you agree with
     18
         that?
     19
               Α.
                      No, not quite.
12:14 20
                      And -- and what about it don't
               Ο.
     21
         you agree?
     22
                       Is that BP had a -- an OMS in
     23
         place which sets out the processes and
     24
         procedures that we followed. It had a local
12:15 25
         OMS which covered the -- the drilling
```

```
1
                    Within that there is a -- a DWOPs
         practices.
      2
         and beyond the -- the best procedures.
      3
         there were procedures and processes in place.
      4
                      Is it your testimony,
               0.
12:15
      5
         Mr. Inglis, that OMS applied to the Deepwater
      6
         Horizon drilling operation at Macondo?
      7
               Α.
                      OMS did apply, yes.
                      I'm sorry?
      8
               0.
      9
                      Yes, it did apply.
12:15 10
                      All right. If there has been
               0.
     11
         testimony from other witnesses that OMS did
     12
         not apply to this operation, you would
     13
         disagree with that?
     14
                      I would disagree with that.
12:15 15
               0.
                      And if, however, the other
     16
         testimony that OMS did not apply to this
     17
         drilling operation, would you agree that it
     18
         should have?
     19
               MR. NEAL: Object to the -- object to
12:16 20
         the form of that question.
     2.1
                      Yeah, my belief is that OMS
     22
         applies.
                   There was an OMS at the group
     23
         level. There was a local OMS. The local OMS
     24
         had been implemented for -- for the drilling
12:16 25
         operations in the deepwater Gulf of Mexico,
```

```
1
         and, therefore, under that local OMS it
      2
         applied.
      3
               Q.
                       (BY MR. DEGRAVELLES) Again, my
      4
         question is a different one because there's
12:16
      5
         been varying testimony on this point.
                      Uh-huh.
      6
               Α.
      7
               Ο.
                      Is it -- if -- if OMS was not
      8
         applicable -- I say "not applicable." If OMS
         was not applied to this drilling operation,
12:16 10
         shouldn't it have been?
     11
               Α.
                      Again, you know, I've given you
     12
         the answer to the question is, it is my
     13
         belief that the OMS was implemented in the
     14
         Gulf of Mexico for drilling. There was a
12:16 15
         drilling LOMS that had been signed off and
     16
         approved in the back end of -- of 2009 -- and
     17
         then -- and the -- the scope of that LOMS
     18
         covered all drilling in the Gulf of Mexico.
     19
                      Okay. I'm asking you a
               Ο.
12:17 20
         hypothetical question.
     2.1
                      And I've given you a -- what I
     22
         believe is -- is an actual direct answer.
     23
                      No, I'm asking you to assume
     24
         hypothetically that your testimony and your
12:17 25
         belief is incorrect and that, in fact, OMS
```

```
1
         was not applied to this operation.
                                              If that
      2
         turns out to be true, would you agree with me
      3
         that in your opinion -- opinion, OMS should
      4
         have applied to this drilling operation?
12:17
      5
               MR. GODFREY: Objection to form.
      6
               MR. NEAL: Objection; form.
      7
               Q.
                       (BY MR. DEGRAVELLES)
                                            Do you
      8
         understand my question?
      9
                      I do. I do understand it.
12:17 10
         have to in a -- I have to understand the
     11
         circumstances of why it wasn't being applied.
     12
         My belief deeply is that it had -- that --
     13
         that the OMS -- the group level existed, the
     14
         OMS -- the Gulf of Mexico existed, that there
12:17 15
         was a local OMS covering the drilling and
     16
         completions activity, that had been signed
     17
         off, then implemented at the back end of
     18
         2009, and, therefore, it was applicable.
     19
                      Okay. And there's no reason
               Ο.
12:18 20
         that you know of that OMS should not have
     21
         applied to this deep -- this Deepwater
     22
         Horizon drilling?
     23
                      There wasn't any, any reason,
               Α.
     24
         no.
12:18 25
                      Okay. And then the nat- --
               Q.
```

```
1
        we're back to the -- the National Commission
      2
        report, and I'm reading the next sentence:
      3
        While initial well design decisions undergo a
      4
        serious peer-review process -- process and
12:18
      5
        changes to well design are subsequently
      6
        subject to a management of change (MOC)
      7
        process, changes to drilling procedures in
        the weeks and days before the implementation
      8
        are typically not subject to any such peer --
12:18 10
        I'm sorry, peer-review or MOC process.
     11
                      Do you agree with that?
     12
               Α.
                      That's not something that I've
     13
        actually seen the detail of, so I'm -- I
     14
        can't comment on that. I don't know
12:19 15
        whether -- I do know there was -- the --
     16
        the -- the risks were identified as part of
     17
         documentation that the -- that I saw, which
     18
        is the FM that I signed.
     19
                      But in terms of the detail of --
12:19 20
        of what happened in terms of peer review
     2.1
        or -- or MOC, I haven't seen that.
     22
                      And then the final sentence --
     23
        not the final -- second-to-last sentence of
     24
        that paragraph, quote, At Macondo such
12:19 25
        decisions appear to have been made by the
```

```
THE STATE OF LOUISIANA:
   PARISH OF
                   ORLEANS :
2
   I, PHYLLIS WALTZ, a Certified Court Reporter,
3
   Registered Professional Reporter, and
   Certified Realtime Reporter in and for the
   State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that
4
   the facts as stated by me in the caption
   hereto are true; that the above and foregoing
   answers of the witness, ANDREW GEORGE INGLIS,
   to the interrogatories as indicated were made
   before me by the said witness after being
7
   first duly sworn to testify the truth, and
   same were reduced to typewriting under my
8
   direction; that the above and foregoing
   deposition as set forth in typewriting is a
   full, true, and correct transcript of the
   proceedings had at the time of taking of said
10
   deposition.
   I further certify that I am not, in any
11
   capacity, a regular employee of the party in
12
   whose behalf this deposition is taken, nor in
   the regular employ of his attorney; and I
13
   certify that I am not interested in the
   cause, nor of kin or counsel to either of the
14
   parties.
15
   GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE, on
                      of JULY, 2011.
   this, the
16
17
18
                      PHYLLIS WALTZ, RPR, CRR
19
                      TEXAS CSR NO. 6813
                      Expiration Date:
                                        12/31/11
20
                      LOUISIANA CCR NO. 2011010
                      Expiration Date:
                                        12/31/11
21
22
   Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
   Firm Certification No. 223
23
   3000 Weslayan, Suite 235
   Houston, Texas
                    77027
24
   (713) 572-2000
25
```

```
1
             UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
             EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA
2
3
   IN RE: OIL SPILL
                           ) MDL NO. 2179
   BY THE OIL RIG
4
   "DEEPWATER HORIZON" IN ) SECTION "J"
   THE GULF OF MEXICO, ON )
5
   APRIL 20, 2010
                           ) JUDGE BARBIER
                           ) MAG. JUDGE SHUSHAN
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
                   *****
                        VOLUME 2
                   *****
18
19
20
                Deposition of ANDREW GEORGE
21
   INGLIS, taken at Kirkland & Ellis
22
   International, 30 St. Mary Axe, 22nd Floor,
23
   London EC3A 8AF, England, United Kingdom, on
24
   the 22nd day of July, 2011.
25
```

```
1
                       It was marked as an exhibit this
               0.
      2
         way, so all I can tell you is it is what it
      3
         is.
      4
               Α.
                       I'll just look at it.
01:09
      5
                      Let me just ask you a question
      6
         before you go any further in the document,
      7
         just as a general matter.
      8
                      Uh-huh.
               Α.
      9
                      Did you have any discussions
01:09 10
         with Ms. Yilmaz in 2008 regarding the need to
     11
         require a set of deliverables from rig
     12
         contractors to assure that they conform to
     13
         the integrity management standard of BP?
     14
                       Just to be precise, say that
01:09 15
         again.
     16
                       Did you have a discussion with
               0.
     17
         Ms. Yilmaz in 2008 as to whether you
     18
         needed -- BP needed to require a set of
     19
         deliverables that would provide assurances on
01:10 20
         rig contractors' conformance to BP's IM
     2.1
         standards?
     22
                       I can't remember having a
     23
         specific conversation around that, that
     24
         issue.
01:10 25
                      Okay. Do you recall in 2009
               Q.
```

```
1
         ever having a specific conversation with her
      2
         about the need to have a set of deliverables
      3
         so that BP could ensure that its IM standards
      4
         were being implemented on contractors' rigs?
01:10
                      I can't -- I can't recall a
      6
         specific conversation around that. It would
      7
        have been through the implementation of -- of
      8
         OMS that you would actually do that. You
        would take the -- as we've discussed over the
01:10 10
         last two days, the segment level OMS, that
     11
         sets the expectations, the SPU level OMS,
     12
         then the local LOMS; and then within that
     13
         there would be the set of tools that would
     14
         apply.
01:11 15
               0.
                      Okay.
     16
                      So if there was a requirement
               Α.
     17
         for bridging standard to the IM standard,
         that would be outlined in that.
     18
     19
                      So I don't think, you know, say,
01:11 20
         in that time frame of 2008 to 2009 it was
     2.1
         very much directing this at the
     22
         implementation of OMS.
     23
                      Let me ask you a question.
                                                    Ιf
     24
         you could just close that for a minute,
01:11 25
        because I feel like it's distracting a
```

```
1
                  I'm not going to ask you about the
         little.
      2
         time.
      3
               Α.
                      You shouldn't have given it to
      4
        me, then.
01:11
                      Apparently. I didn't realize it
               0.
      6
        was so fascinating.
      7
                      Who -- if a bridging contract
         says that the contractor's rig -- the
      8
         contractor's safety management system will
01:11 10
         apply, but that BP will compare it to OMS and
     11
         fill any gaps as necessary, you understand
     12
         that?
     13
               Α.
                      Yeah, I don't think it's fill
     14
         any gaps as necessary. What you want to
         do --
01:11 15
     16
                      Supplement?
               0.
     17
                      No, what you want to do is make
     18
         sure there's conformance with it.
     19
                      And if there isn't conformance
               Ο.
01:12 20
        with it, what do you do?
     2.1
                      You would find a way of ensuring
     22
         that, you know, one system applies, which
     23
         would be in general the approach would be
     24
         that the contractor's safety management
01:12 25
         system applies and then you would look to
```

```
make sure that it's bridged to the BP process
      2
        and if there are areas where there needs to
      3
        be a -- a supplementary approach applied, you
      4
         identify those.
01:12
                      Okay. How does one go about --
      6
        how does BP go about identifying the
      7
         supplementary approach when it finds that
      8
         there are areas that need additional safety
        management procedures on a contractor's rig?
01:12 10
                      Well, it would go through the
     11
        process.
                   It would take the contractor's SMS,
     12
         compare it to the requirements for -- for
     13
         OMS, and it would look to create that
     14
        bridging document.
01:13 15
               Ο.
                      All right, okay.
     16
               Α.
                      So there were expectations.
     17
               Q.
                      Who was responsible for making
     18
         that comparison?
     19
                      Yeah, that would be done in
01:13 20
        the -- in the drilling -- in the -- in -- in
     2.1
         the drilling organization, under the BP
     22
         drilling and completions.
     23
                      Who was ultimately responsible
               0.
     24
         for making sure that that comparison was
01:13 25
        made?
```

```
1
                      As I said, it would be in each
               Α.
      2
         of the SPUs around the world it would be the
      3
        VP of drilling and operations, and then
      4
        underneath him there would be people who
01:13
        would be accountable for the individual rigs.
      6
                      Okay. So the VP of drilling and
      7
         completions is responsible for ensuring that
      8
         this comparison that you just testified about
      9
         of --
01:13 10
                      Yeah, what I'm just -- let's go
               Α.
     11
        back to --
     12
                      Well, can I finish my question?
               0.
     13
               Α.
                      I'm sorry.
     14
               Q.
                      I just want to confirm that the
01:13 15
         VP -- in the Gulf of Mexico for drilling and
     16
         completions the vice president for D&C is
     17
         respon- -- is ultimately responsible for
     18
         ensuring that the comparison of the safety
     19
        management systems is completed and that if
01:14 20
         there are any supplementary procedures, that
     2.1
         those be filled in on the rig?
     22
               MR. NEAL:
                         Object to the form.
     23
               MR. GODFREY: Object to form.
     24
               MR. NEAL: Go ahead.
01:14 25
                      The -- as we discussed, the
               Α.
```

```
1
        operating management system that BP had in
      2
        place is based around an OMS going to an SPU
      3
        OMS --
               Ο.
                  (BY MS. HERTZ) I understand all
01:14
      5
        that.
      6
               MR. NEAL: Please don't interrupt.
      7
               Α.
                      Let me -- I would like to be
      8
        able to finish answering the question. Which
        then goes to the local OMS. The D&C for --
01:14 10
        for OMS, the person accountable for
     11
        operations and conformance -- and conformance
     12
        with the LOMS is the BP drilling and
     13
        completions.
     14
               Q.
                      (BY MS. HERTZ) Okay. So the
01:15 15
        person responsible for conformance of a
     16
        contractor's SMS --
     17
                      No, what I said was the
     18
        person -- the individual that's accountable
     19
         for conformance with the LOMS is the --
01:15 20
               Q.
                      Right.
     2.1
                      -- is the VP drilling and
     22
        completions.
     23
                  And is he also responsible for
               0.
     24
        the --
01:15 25
               Α.
                      That's -- that's part -- as part
```

```
THE STATE OF LOUISIANA:
   PARISH OF
                  ORLEANS :
   I, PHYLLIS WALTZ, a Certified Court Reporter,
3
   Registered Professional Reporter, and
   Certified Realtime Reporter in and for the
   State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that
4
   the facts as stated by me in the caption
   hereto are true; that the above and foregoing
   answers of the witness, ANDREW GEORGE INGLIS,
   to the interrogatories as indicated were made
   before me by the said witness after being
   first duly sworn to testify the truth, and
   same were reduced to typewriting under my
   direction; that the above and foregoing
   deposition as set forth in typewriting is a
   full, true, and correct transcript of the
   proceedings had at the time of taking of said
10
   deposition.
   I further certify that I am not, in any
11
   capacity, a regular employee of the party in
   whose behalf this deposition is taken, nor in
12
   the regular employ of his attorney; and I
13
   certify that I am not interested in the
   cause, nor of kin or counsel to either of the
14
   parties.
1.5
   GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF OFFICE, on
   this, the 23RD day of JULY, 2011.
16
17
18
                      PHYLLIS WALTZ, RPR, CRR
19
                      TEXAS CSR NO. 6813
                      Expiration Date: 12/31/11
20
                      LOUISIANA CCR NO. 2011010
                      Expiration Date:
                                        12/31/11
21
22
   Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
   Firm Certification No. 223
23
   3000 Weslayan, Suite 235
   Houston, Texas
                   77027
24
   (713) 572-2000
25
```